

Statistical properties of driven Magnetohydrodynamic turbulence in three dimensions: Novel universality

ABHIK BASU (*)

Abteilung Theorie, Hahn-Meitner-Institut, Glienicker Strasse 100, D-14109 Berlin, Germany, and Poornaprajna Institute of Scientific Research, Bangalore, India.

PACS. 64.60Ht – .
 PACS. 0.5.70.Ln – .
 PACS. 47.65+a – .

Abstract. – We analyse the universal properties of nonequilibrium steady states of driven Magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) turbulence in three dimensions ($3d$). We elucidate the dependence of various phenomenologically important dimensionless constants on the symmetries of the two-point correlation functions. We, for the first time, also suggest the intriguing possibility of multiscaling universality class varying continuously with certain dimensionless parameters. The experimental and theoretical implications of our results are discussed.

In the vicinity of a critical point, equilibrium systems show universal scaling properties for thermodynamic functions and correlation functions: These are characterised by universal scaling exponents that depend on the spatial dimension d and the symmetry of the order parameter (e.g., Ising, XY etc.) [1], but not on the parameters that specify the details of the Hamiltonian. A notable exception is the class of two-dimensional models, such as the XY model in $d = 2$, in which continuously varying scaling exponents are found [2]. Dynamic scaling exponents, that characterise the behaviour of time-dependent correlation functions also show universality [3]. A different situation arises in driven, dissipative, nonequilibrium systems with nonequilibrium statistical steady states (NESS). We show here that driven homogeneous and isotropic MHD turbulence in three dimensions ($3d$) is a good natural candidate for a system with an NESS whose universal properties vary continuously with the degree of cross-correlations between the velocity and magnetic fields. Our results illustrate the sensitivities of the statistical properties of nonequilibrium steady states on the parameters of the model, a situation which does not arise in equilibrium systems.

Turbulence in plasmas is described by the equations of MHD [4] in $3d$ for the coupled evolution of the velocity field $\mathbf{v}$ and the magnetic field $\mathbf{b}$. Solar-wind data [5] and numerical simulations of the $3d$ MHD equations as well as shell models [6] show multiscaling corrections to the simple Kolmogorov (K41) scaling [7] for the structure functions of $\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{b}$: $S_a^p(r) \equiv \langle [|a_i(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{r}) - a_i(\mathbf{x})|^p] \rangle \sim r^{\zeta_p^a}$, $a = v, b$ for r in the inertial range between the forcing scale L and the dissipation scale η_d (i.e., $L \gg r \gg \eta_d$). In observations and experiments magnetic Prandtl number P_m (=the ratio of the magnetic to kinetic viscosity) and $e \equiv \frac{E_m}{E_v}$ (the ratio

(*) email: basu@hmi.de

of the magnetic- to the kinetic- energy) are known to have a wide range of values: $e \ll 1 \Rightarrow$ kinetic regime of 3dMHD (as on the solar surface), $e \sim O(1) \Rightarrow$ equipartition regime (e.g., solar wind in its rest frame) and $e \gg 1 \Rightarrow$ magnetic regime (e.g., fusion plasmas) [8]. Similarly P_m can be high (> 1), e.g., in galactic and proto galactic plasmas [9]. Low values of P_m are found in liquid metals [10]. In numerical simulations, the structure functions of $\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ in 3d exhibit multiscaling with exponents different from their fluid analogues [6, 11]. In particular Ref. [6] elucidated different multiscaling exponents for $\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ (i.e., $\zeta_p^v \neq \zeta_p^b$).

In this letter we develop a one-loop, self-consistent theory for the randomly forced 3dMHD equations and use it to calculate several interesting results concerning its NESS. We show, in particular, that (i) the variation of e and renormalised (effective) P_m are connected to each other (ii) P_m , e , Kolmogorov's constants K_v and K_b (see below) vary with the degree of crosscorrelations between $\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{b}$. We calculate the intermittency exponents (these in a log-normal model provide approximate estimates of the deviations from the K41 scaling) which also vary continuously with the degree of crosscorrelations between $\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{b}$. This suggests an interesting possibility of continuously varying multiscaling universality classes for 3dMHD. We show that these variations are linked with the ratios of the different two-point correlation functions. Our observations on multiscaling of 3dMHD based on our self-consistent calculations on a log-normal model allows for different multiscaling exponents for the velocity and magnetic fields as reported in Ref. [6].

The 3dMHD equations consist of the Navier-Stokes equation for the velocity field $\mathbf{v}$ supplemented by the Lorentz force due to the magnetic field $\mathbf{b}$:

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} = -\frac{\nabla p}{\rho} + \frac{(\nabla \times \mathbf{b}) \times \mathbf{b}}{4\pi\rho} + \nu_o \nabla^2 \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{f} \quad (1)$$

with $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0$ (incompressibility) and Ampère's law for a conducting fluid

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{b}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} + \mu_o \nabla^2 \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{g}. \quad (2)$$

In (1) and (2), ρ is the fluid density, p is the pressure, μ_o is the “magnetic viscosity”, arising from the nonzero resistivity of the plasma, ν_o is the kinematic viscosity and $\mathbf{f}$ and $\mathbf{g}$ are forcing functions. Under rescaling of space and time $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ scale as $v_i(l\mathbf{x}, l^z t) \rightarrow l^{\chi_1} v_i$, $b_i(l\mathbf{x}, l^z t) \rightarrow l^{\chi_2} b_i(\mathbf{x}, t)$. Since $\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ are polar and axial vectors respectively, crosscorrelation tensor $\langle v_i(\mathbf{k}, t) b_j(-\mathbf{k}, 0) \rangle$ is odd and imaginary in wavevector $\mathbf{k}$ [12].

We employ a self-consistent mode coupling scheme (SCMC). The response and the correlation functions of the fields $\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ are defined by $v_i \equiv G_v f_i$, $b_i \equiv G_b g_i$, and correlators $C_{ij}^v \equiv \langle v_i(\mathbf{k}, t) v_j(-\mathbf{k}, 0) \rangle$, $C_{ij}^b \equiv \langle b_i(\mathbf{k}, t) b_j(-\mathbf{k}, 0) \rangle$ with the crosscorrelator $C_{ij}^c \equiv \langle v_i(\mathbf{k}, t) b_j(-\mathbf{k}, 0) \rangle$. In the scaling limit, in terms of the dynamic exponent z and the roughness exponents χ_1 and χ_2 , $G_v^{-1} = i\omega - \Sigma_v(k, \omega)$, $G_b^{-1} = i\omega - \Sigma_b(k, \omega)$ where $\Sigma_v = k^{-z} \eta_v(\omega/k^z)$, $\Sigma_b = k^{-z} \eta_b(\omega/k^z)$ are the self-energies whereas the correlators are given by $C_{ij}^v = P_{ij} k^{-d-2\chi_1-z} \eta_1(\omega/k^z)$, $C_{ij}^b = P_{ij} k^{-d-2\chi_2-z} \eta_2(\omega/k^z)$. $\eta_v(\omega/k^z)$, $\eta_b(\omega/k^z)$, $\eta_1(\omega/k^z)$, $\eta_2(\omega/k^z)$ are scaling functions and P_{ij} is the transverse projection operator. In systems out of equilibrium, there is no particular relation between the noise variance and the dissipation coefficient, unlike their equilibrium counterparts where such a relation exists due to the Fluctuation-Dissipation-Theorem. It is also well-known that the statistical properties of the nonequilibrium systems depend strongly on the noise variances. We, here in particular, take the forcing terms $\mathbf{f}$, $\mathbf{g}$ to be Gaussian noises with zero mean and covariances proportional to k^{-d} in d -dimension [13]. This ensures that, in absence of a mean magnetic field, the energy spectra are K41-like [6, 7]. In this model, the advective nonlinearities and the noise variances do not renormalize. This means under

simultaneous rescaling of space and time, the nonlinear vertices and the noise variances are affected only by their naive scaling dimensions. At the fixed point, these conditions leads to *strong dynamical scaling*, i.e., same dynamic exponent for both the fields and immediately yield $z = 2/3$, $\chi_1 = \chi_2 = \chi = 1/3$ corresponding to K41 scaling [12, 14]. Hence the ratios of various correlations are dimensionless numbers. We assume Lorentzian line shapes for the self-energies and the correlation functions. The fact that the values of the scaling exponents z and χ are dimension independent is because the noise correlations change as a function of dimensionality in such a way as to render the exponents dimension independent.

We start with the zero-frequency forms for the self-energies (or the relaxation rates) $\Sigma_v(k, \omega = 0) = \nu k^z$, $\Sigma_b(k, \omega = 0) = \mu k^z$, and the correlations $C_{ij}^v(k, \omega = 0) = \frac{2D_1}{\nu^2} P_{ij} k^{-2\chi-d-z}$, $C_{ij}^b(k, \omega = 0) = \frac{2D_2}{\mu^2} P_{ij} k^{-2\chi-z-d}$, in d -dimension. The crosscorrelation tensor C_{ij}^c in general has both symmetric C_{ij}^s and antisymmetric C_{ij}^a parts: $C_{ij}^c = C_{ij}^s + C_{ij}^a$; $C_{ij}^s(k, \omega = 0) = \frac{2i\tilde{D}(\mathbf{k})P_{ij}}{\nu\mu} k^{-2\chi-z-d}$, in d -dimension and with $\tilde{D}(\mathbf{k}) = -\tilde{D}(-\mathbf{k})$; $\tilde{D}(\mathbf{k})\tilde{D}(\mathbf{k}) = (\tilde{D})^2$ and $C_{ij}^a(k, \omega = 0) = \frac{2i\tilde{D}}{\nu\mu} \epsilon_{ijp} k_p k^{-2\chi-z-d}$ (this form is for $3d$ only). The mean crosshelicity $\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \langle \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{b}(-\mathbf{k}) \rangle$ and mean electromotive force $\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \langle \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{k}) \times \mathbf{b}(-\mathbf{k}) \rangle$ are proportional to $\tilde{D}$ and $\hat{D}$ respectively. Here ϵ_{ijp} is the totally antisymmetric tensor in $3d$. Previous renormalisation group/self-consistent approach to $3d$ MHD did not take any crosscorrelation function [14] fully into consideration. The noises in stochastically driven models, such as Eqs. (1) and (2), represent coarse-grained effects of the degrees of freedom whose time-scales of decay are faster than the coarse-grained variables ($\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{b}$) used. Since both the noises in Eqs. (1) and (2) have same microscopic origin there is no a priori reason for their crosscorrelations to vanish always. In SCMC approach vertex corrections are neglected. Lack of vertex renormalisations in the zero wavevector limit in $3d$ MHD allows SCMC to yield *exact* relations between the scaling exponents z and χ , as in the the noisy Burgers/Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation [15]. In the context of the noisy Burgers equation in $1+1$ dimensions, Frey *et al* have shown, by using nonrenormalisation of the advective nonlinearities and a second-order perturbation theory, that the effects of the vertex corrections on the correlation functions are very small [16]. Similar conclusions for $3d$ MHD will presumably follow from the vertex nonrenormalisations in $3d$ MHD, though a rigorous calculation is still lacking.

One may note that the symmetries of the symmetric and the antisymmetric parts of the crosscorrelations are different under the exchange of the cartesian indices. Hence, the presence of one does not lead to the generation of the other by non-linear interactions. Thus it is possible to treat them separately without any loss of generality. It is straight forward to extend the various expressions derived in the paper for the case when both the symmetric and the anti-symmetric parts are present.

Symmetric Cross-correlations. - We obtain the one-loop self-consistent integral equations for the self-energies and correlation functions. The one-loop diagrammatic corrections to the crosscorrelation function vanish as it is odd in momentum (see, e.g., [17]). We first consider the case when $\hat{D} = 0$, i.e., no antisymmetric part of the crosscorrelations. By matching at $\omega = 0$, for the self-energies we obtain (by using $\chi = 1/3$, $z = 2/3$) in any dimension d

$$\nu = \frac{3D_1}{4\nu^2} \frac{S_d}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{d-1}{(d+2)} + \frac{3D_2}{4\mu^2} \frac{S_d}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{d^2+d-4}{d(d+2)}, \quad (3)$$

$$\mu = \frac{3D_1}{2\nu(\nu+\mu)} \frac{S_d}{(2\pi)^d} \left(1 - \frac{1}{d}\right) + \frac{3D_2}{2\mu(\nu+\mu)} \frac{S_d}{(2\pi)^d} \left(1 - \frac{3}{d}\right). \quad (4)$$

Similarly, by demanding consistency in the amplitudes of the correlations we get

$$\frac{D_1}{D_2} = \frac{\left[\frac{D_1^2}{\nu^3} + \frac{D_2^2}{\mu^3} - \frac{4\tilde{D}^2}{\nu\mu(\nu+\mu)} \right] \left[1 - \frac{2}{d} + \frac{2}{d(d+2)} \right]}{\left[\frac{4D_1D_2}{\nu\mu(\nu+\mu)^3} + \frac{16\tilde{D}^2}{(\nu+\mu)^3} \right] \left(1 - \frac{2}{d} \right)}. \quad (5)$$

In terms of the *renormalised magnetic Prandtl number* $P_m = \mu/\nu$ and $\Gamma = D_2/D_1$ we can write Eqs.(3), (4) and (5) as

$$P_m^{-1} = \frac{\frac{d-1}{2(d+2)} + \frac{\Gamma}{2P_m^2} \left[\frac{d^2+d-4}{d(d+2)} \right]}{\frac{1}{1+P_m} \left(1 - \frac{1}{d} \right) + \frac{\Gamma}{P_m(1+P_m)} \left(1 - \frac{3}{d} \right)}, \quad (6)$$

$$\text{and } \Gamma = \frac{\left[1 + \frac{\Gamma^2}{P_m^3} - \frac{4\tilde{\beta}}{P_m(1+P_m)} \right] \left[1 - \frac{2}{d} + \frac{2}{d(d+2)} \right]}{\left[\frac{4\Gamma^{-1}}{P_m(1+P_m)} + \frac{16\tilde{\beta}}{(1+P_m)^3\Gamma^2} \right] \left(1 - \frac{2}{d} \right)}, \quad (7)$$

where $\tilde{\beta} = (\frac{\tilde{D}}{D_1})^2$. Equations (6) and (7) *explicitly* demonstrate that P_m and the magnetic-to kinetic- energy ratio $e = \frac{\Gamma}{P_m}$ depend on each other. When $\tilde{\beta} = 0$, i.e., zero crosshelicity, Eqs.(6) and (7) yield $P_m = 0.67$ and $\Gamma = 0.63$ and hence energy-ratio $e = \Gamma/P_m \approx 0.94$ in $3d$. Thus for zero crosshelicity P_m and e are *fixed* numbers. But with finite crosshelicity, i.e., a finite $\tilde{\beta}$ in Eqs.(6) and (7), P_m and Γ and hence e depend on $\tilde{\beta}$ in any dimension d . For $\tilde{\beta} > 0$ few representative values of P_m and Γ in $3d$ are given in Table 1.

Anti-Symmetric Cross-Correlations. – For the effects of the antisymmetric part (under the exchange of i and j , i, j are Cartesian indices) of the crosscorrelation function in $3d$ on the long wavelength properties we again use self-consistent methods. Equations (3) and (4) remain unaltered. However, Eq.(5) is changed to

$$\frac{D_1}{D_2} = \frac{\left[\frac{D_1^2}{\nu^3} + \frac{D_2^2}{\mu^3} \right] \frac{2}{5} + \frac{4\hat{D}^2}{3\nu\mu(\nu+\mu)}}{\left[\frac{4D_1D_2}{3\nu\mu(\nu+\mu)} - \frac{16\hat{D}^2}{3(\nu+\mu)^3} \right]}. \quad (8)$$

Again by defining $\hat{\beta} = (\frac{\hat{D}}{D_1})^2$, we obtain self-consistently

$$\Gamma = \frac{\left[1 + \frac{\Gamma^2}{P_m^3} \right] \frac{2}{5} + \frac{4\hat{\beta}}{3(1+P_m)}}{\left[\frac{4\Gamma^{-1}}{3P_m(1+P_m)} - \frac{16\hat{\beta}}{3(1+P_m)^3} \right]}. \quad (9)$$

Thus Eqs.(6) and (9) together provide self-consistent relations between P_m and Γ and hence between P_m and e when there is a finite antisymmetric crosscorrelation. A few representative values of P_m and Γ for $\hat{\beta} > 0$ are given in Table 1.

Kolmogorov's constants. – According to the Kolmogorov's hypothesis for fluid turbulence [7] in the inertial range energy spectrum $E(k) = K_o \epsilon^{2/3} k^{-5/3}$, where K_o , a *universal* constant, is the Kolmogorov's constant and ϵ is the energy dissipation rate per unit mass. Various calculations, based on different techniques by different groups [18, 19, 13, 20] show that $K_o \sim 1.5$ in three dimensions. For MHD, by using Novikov's theorem [21], we connect the dissipation of the total energy with the *sum* of the velocity and magnetic field correlation-amplitudes. We can then relate the dissipation of the *reduced energy* $E_R = E_v - E_b$ with the correlation-amplitudes. Thus, in the lowest order of the perturbation theory we calculate the coefficients of the velocity

and magnetic field correlations in terms of dissipation rates: $E_v(k) = K_v \epsilon_v^{2/3} k^{-5/3}$; $E_b(k) = K_b \epsilon_b^{2/3} k^{-5/3}$. K_v and K_b are the Kolmogorov's constants for MHD, and ϵ_v and ϵ_b are the mean dissipation rates of the kinetic energy and magnetic energy respectively. In absence of a mean magnetic field energy spectra scale as $k^{-5/3}$ in the inertial range [6]. In Ref. [22] Kolmogorov's constants for MHD turbulence (for the Elsässer variables) have been calculated incorrectly for various energy-ratio e due to the absence of crosscorrelation functions of appropriate structure. We work out the Kolmogorov's constants with finite crosscorrelation functions. From Eq.(6) in dimension $d = 3$, we have $\nu = [\frac{0.6D_1}{4} \frac{S_3}{(2\pi)^3}]^{\frac{1}{3}} (1 + \frac{4}{3} \frac{\Gamma}{P_m^2})^{\frac{1}{3}}$. In our notations, $\langle v_i(\mathbf{k}, \omega) v_j(-\mathbf{k}, -\omega) \rangle = \frac{2D_1 P_{ij} k^{-3}}{\omega^2 + \nu^2 k^{2z}}$ which in $3d$ gives (in the inertial range) for kinetic energy spectrum $E_v(k) = 1.186[2D_1(1 + .62\{1 + \frac{\Gamma^2}{P_m^3} - \frac{4a}{P_m(1+P_m)}\})]^{\frac{2}{3}} \frac{S_3}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{k^{-5/3}}{(1+1.33\frac{\Gamma}{P_m^2})^{1/3}}$. To connect dissipation rate ϵ_v with noise correlation amplitude D_1 we use Novikov's theorem [21] which gives $2D_1 \frac{S_3}{(2\pi)^3} = \epsilon_v$. Substituting this in $E_v(k)$ above, we obtain Kolmogorov's constant

$$K_v = 1.186 \frac{[1 + .62\{1 + \frac{\Gamma^2}{P_m^3} - \frac{4a}{P_m(1+P_m)}\}]^{2/3}}{(1 + 1.33\frac{\Gamma}{P_m^2})^{1/3}}, \quad (10)$$

where $a = \tilde{\beta}, -\hat{\beta}$ for finite symmetric and antisymmetric crosscorrelations respectively. A similar calculation yields $K_b = K_v$. Our results show, unsurprisingly, that K_v and K_b are *not* fixed numbers, rather they depend upon other dimensionless numbers like magnetic Prandtl number P_m and energy-ratio e . For $\Gamma = 0$, i.e., for no magnetic fields we get the result $K_v = 1.63$ for pure fluid turbulence which is well-within the range of accepted values [19, 23].

Possibilities of variable multifractality.— Experiments and numerical simulations [6, 11] find nonlinear multiscaling corrections to the K41 prediction of $\zeta_p^a = p/3$ for the structure functions in the inertial range. Until the date, no controlled perturbative calculation for ζ_p^a is available. To account for multiscaling in fluid turbulence, however, Obukhov [24] and Kolmogorov [25] assumed a log-normal distribution for dissipation ϵ to arrive at $S_p^v(r) = \langle |\Delta v|^p \rangle = C_p \bar{\epsilon}^{p/3} r^{p/3} (\frac{L}{r})^{(\bar{\delta}/2)p(p-3)}$, where $\bar{\epsilon}$ is the mean value of ϵ and $\langle \epsilon(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{r}) \epsilon(\mathbf{x}) \rangle \propto \langle (\Delta v)^6 / r^2 \rangle \sim (L/r)^{9\bar{\delta}}$. For small $\bar{\delta}$, $\bar{\delta} \simeq 9\bar{\delta}$. A standard calculation on the randomly stirred model yields *intermittency exponent* $\delta = 0.2$ [26] where $\delta = 9\bar{\delta}$. whereas the best possible estimates from experiments is 0.23 [26]. In MHD dissipations of kinetic- (ϵ_v) and magnetic- (ϵ_b) energies fluctuate in space and time. Consequently we define two intermittency exponents δ_v, δ_b for the kinetic [$\epsilon_v = \frac{1}{2}\nu \sum_{\alpha\beta} (\frac{\partial v_\alpha}{\partial x_\beta} + \frac{\partial v_\beta}{\partial x_\alpha})^2$], and magnetic energy dissipations [$\epsilon_b = \frac{1}{2}\mu \sum_{\alpha\beta} (\frac{\partial b_\alpha}{\partial x_\beta} + \frac{\partial b_\beta}{\partial x_\alpha})^2$] to explain the deviations from the K41 scaling. We calculate the exponents below by using the Eqs.(1) and (2) following closely Ref. [26]. We work with the self-consistent forms for the self-energies and correlation functions given above along with the consistency relations for the amplitude-ratios $\Gamma, \tilde{\beta}, \hat{\beta}$ and P_m .

Following Ref. [26], we find the dissipation correlation functions in $3d$ to be $\langle \epsilon_v(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{r}) \epsilon_v(\mathbf{x}) \rangle \simeq 12.4 \epsilon_v^2 \alpha_v^2 K_v^2 \ln \frac{L}{r}$, $\langle \epsilon_b(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{r}) \epsilon_b(\mathbf{x}) \rangle \simeq 12.4 \epsilon_v^2 \alpha_v^2 \Gamma^2 K_v^2 \ln \frac{L}{r}$. α_v is defined by the relation $\nu = \alpha_v \epsilon_v^{1/3}$. By using Eqs.(3), (4), (6), (7) and (9) we find, in $3d$,

$$\alpha_v = 0.4[1.62 + 0.62(\frac{\Gamma^2}{P_m^3} - \frac{4a}{P_m(1+P_m)})]^{1/3} [1 + 1.33\frac{\Gamma}{P_m^2}]^{1/3}, \quad (11)$$

where $a = \tilde{\beta}$ and $-\hat{\beta}$ for finite symmetric and antisymmetric crosscorrelations respectively. For the pure fluid case $\alpha_v \simeq 0.5$ [13] and is *universal*. For MHD, however we see that α_v

varies with $\tilde{\beta}$ and $\hat{\beta}$, similar to K_v . We then obtain fluid intermittency exponent

$$\delta_v = 0.2 \left[1 + 0.4 \left(\frac{\Gamma^2}{P_m^3} - \frac{4a}{P_m(1+P_m)} \right) \right]^{4/3}, \quad (12)$$

where, a is the same as before. A similar calculation obtains magnetic intermittency exponent $\delta_b = \Gamma^2 \delta_v$. As expected, both δ_v and δ_b vary with P_m and Γ (or e). In general, the intermittency corrections to the simple K41 scaling of the $\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ structure functions are *unequal*, as has been seen in the direct numerical simulations (DNS) and shell-model studies [6]. The presence of multiple intermittency exponents makes it difficult to directly extend the fluid log-normal intermittency model to 3dMHD. However, the continuous variations of the intermittency exponents with $\tilde{\beta}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ strongly suggest *continuously varying multiscaling universality classes* for 3dMHD.

In our calculations, $\tilde{\beta}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ parametrise the internal symmetries of the system. They represent the relative strengths of the symmetric and anti-symmetric parts of the crosscorrelation function. Therefore, $\tilde{\beta}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ characterise the symmetries of the two-point correlation functions under inversion of the parity and exchange of the cartesian indices. Results from our log-normal model-type calculations open up an intriguing possibility of multiscaling properties varying continuously with symmetries parametrised by the dimensionless numbers described above. We believe that our results (despite the limitations of mode coupling theories - see, e.g., [13, 27]) will provide a valuable insight to the understanding of the difference in the multiscaling properties of the velocity and magnetic fields [6] and may also explain the somewhat different numerical estimates of the multiscaling exponents by different groups [6, 11]. We believe our results will stimulate further numerical as well as experimental studies for the measurements of the dimensionless parameters introduced above. To check our results we suggest MHD experiments on liquid sodium systems with active grids and random passage of current. Various $\tilde{\beta}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ can be achieved in experiments/simulations by controlling the appropriate Grashof numbers [28], constructed out of the various noise correlators in stochastically driven MHD and by measuring the cross helicity, the electromotive force and the kinetic energy in the steady state. Renormalised P_m can be calculated by measuring time-dependent correlations. In closing we note that many natural systems, e.g., solar wind, plasmas in tokamak have strong mean magnetic fields making them anisotropic. Such effects can also be included in our scheme of calculations by appropriately modifying the form of the self-energies.

From a broader point of view, our results unveil qualitatively new properties in the steady-states of nonequilibrium driven, diffusive systems. In contrast to the more well-known equilibrium systems, we illustrate the richness of nonequilibrium phenomenologies by using 3dMHD as an example. Recently, Drossel *et al* [29], in a set of coupled Langevin equations describing the interplay between phase ordering dynamics in the bulk and roughening dynamics of the interface of binary films, find a similar continuous variation of the dynamical exponent with the coupling strength of the bulk and surface fields. Recently, continuously varying universal properties in the context of a simple coupled Burgers-like model has been discussed in Ref. [30]. Here, for the first time, we illustrate a natural realisation of continuously varying multiscaling universality class in 3dMHD. We believe our studies will provide further stimuli to the studies of these new aspects of driven nonequilibrium systems.

The author thanks the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung, Germany for financial support and R. Pandit, E. Frey and J. Santos for their critical comments on the manuscript.

TABLE I – Representative values of P_m , Γ , e , K_v , α_v and δ_v as functions of $\tilde{\beta}$ and $\hat{\beta}$.

P_m	Γ	e	$\tilde{\beta}$	$\hat{\beta}$	K_v	α_v	δ_v
-	0	0	0	0	1.6	0.47	0.2
1	1.76	1.76	3	0	0.6	0.6	0.04
0.1	0.06	0.6	0	0.15	3.5	1.6	10
0.67	0.63	0.94	0	0	1.52	0.76	0.6

REFERENCES

- [1] M. E. Fisher in *Lecture Notes in Physics: Critical Phenomena*, Springer Verlag, Berlin (1983).
- [2] P. M. Chaikin and T. C. Lubensky, *Principles of condensed matter physics*, Foundation Books, New Delhi (1998).
- [3] P. C. Hohenberg and B. I. Halperin, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **49**, 435 (1977).
- [4] J D Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, 2nd edn., Wiley Eastern, New Delhi, (1975).
- [5] R. Grauer *et al*, *Phys. Plasmas* **2**, 41 (1995).
- [6] A. Basu, A. Sain, S.K. Dhar and R. Pandit, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **19**, 19, 1999.
- [7] A. N. Kolmogorov, C. R. Acad. Sci. USSR **30**, 301 (1941).
- [8] D. Montgomery, *Lecture Notes on Turbulence*, eds. J. R. Herring and J.C. McWilliam, World Scientific, Singapore, 1989.
- [9] A. Schekochihin, S. Boldyrev and R. Kulsrud, astro-ph/0103333.
- [10] L. Marié *et al*, *Dynamo and Dynamics: a Mathematical Challenge*, Kluwer Academic Publishers (2001).
- [11] J. Cho, A. Lazarin and E. T. Vishniac, *ApJ*, **564**, 291 (2002); D. Biskamp and W. Müller, *Phys. Plasmas*, **7**, 4889 (2000).
- [12] A. Basu, J. K. Bhattacharjee and S. Ramaswamy, *Eur. Phys. J B*, **9**, 725 (1999).
- [13] V. Yakhot and S.A. Orzag, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 1722 (1986).
- [14] J-D Fournier, P-L Sulem and A. Pouquet, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **15**, 1393 (1982); S. J. Camargo and H. Tusso, *Phys. Fluids B* **4**, 1199 (1992); M. K. Verma, *Phys. PLasma* **6**, 1455 (1999); A. Pouquet *et al*, *J. Phys. Lett. (Paris)* **39**, L199 (1978); L.L. Kichatinov, *Magnetohydrodynamics* **21**, 105 (1985); R. G. Kleva, *Phys. Fluid* **29**, 2882 (1986); Y. Zhou and G. Vahala, *J. Plasma Phys.* **39**, 511 (1988); D. W. Longcope and R. N. Sudan, *Phys. Fluid B* **3**, 1945 (1991).
- [15] D. Forster *et al*, *Phys. Rev A*, **16**, 732 (1977); J.K. Bhattacharjee, *J. Phys. A*, **31**, L93 (1998).
- [16] E. Frey, U. C. Täuber and T. Hwa, *Phys. Rev. E*, **53**, 4424 (1996).
- [17] A. Basu, *Phys. Rev E* **61**, 1407 (2000).
- [18] R. H. Kraichnan, *J. Fluid Mech.*, **47**, 525 (1971).
- [19] C. D. Leslie, *Developments in the Theory of Turbulence*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1973.
- [20] J. K. Bhattacharjee, *Phys. Fluid A* **3**, 879 (1991).
- [21] W. A. Woyczynski, *Burgers-KPZ Turbulence-Göttingen Lectures*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1998; W.D McComb, *The Physics of Fluid Turbulence*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1990.
- [22] M. K. Verma and J. K. Bhattacharjee, *Europhys. Lett.* **31**, 195 (1995).
- [23] V. I. Belinicher and V. S. L'vov, *Sov. Phys. JETP*, **66**, 303 (1987).
- [24] A. M. Obukhov, *J. Fluid Mech.*, **13**, 77 (1962).
- [25] A. M. Kolmogorov, *J. Fluid Mech.*, **13**, 82 (1962).
- [26] A. Das and J. K. Bhattacharjee, *Europhys. Lett.*, **26**, 527 (1994).
- [27] G.L. Eyink, *Phys. Fluids*, **6**, 3063 (1994).
- [28] C. R. Doering and J. D. Gibbon, *Applied analysis of the Navier-Stokes equation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1995).
- [29] B. Drossel *et al*, cond-mat/0307579 (eprint).
- [30] A. Basu and E. Frey, unpublished.